

REMARKS

With respect to the Section 112 objection, the Examiner points out that the material cited on page 3, lines 1-5, was of no help in assessing the enablement rejection. The Applicant regrets that the citation was found not to be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for receiving a client request for help related to a web page. The receipt of a client request for help related to a web page may be initiated by the user, that request implemented by operating a help icon. See the specification at page 4, lines 9-15. In response to the selection of the help icon, a client agent, resident on the client 12, intercepts the Internet web page information such as its uniform resource locator (URL). See the specification at page 4, lines 18-21. The client agent may then forward the information about the client, the web page, and the uniform resource locator to the help server.

The claim further calls for “automatically providing information to remotely access said web page.” Thus, the client’s system receives the help request by activation of the help icon, as pointed out above, and, in the illustrated embodiment, it is the client agent that automatically traps the information needed for the server to remotely access the web page. In other words, as explained in the specification and the material cited above, the client agent automatically traps the uniform resource locator. This is all the help server would need in order to access the web page.

Claim 1 may be read on the client device. The client device actually receives the client request for help and automatically provides the information that the help server would need to access the web page. It does this by trapping the uniform resource locator of the web page that raised the issue that generated the help request and by automatically forwarding that information to the help server as indicated in the specification at page 4, lines 21-23. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is fully supported by the specification. On the same basis, claims 11 and 21 are also fully supported.

Claim 28 is written so that it may be read on the help server. Claim 28 calls for a medium storing instructions that receive information about a web page accessed by another processor-based system. Thus, the server receives the information from the client agent about a web page that is causing problems and that was accessed by the client device. In one case, the client device would be the so-called “another processor-based system.” The information is used

to simultaneously access the web page. That information, in the illustrated embodiment, could be the uniform resource locator which is used by the server to access the same web page. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 28 is respectfully requested. On the same basis, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 30 is requested.

With respect to the objection based on Price, it is believed that the position being taken is that the limitations have no support in the specification and, therefore, they are not relied upon. For the reasons set forth in the prior response, it is noted that Price does not teach the claimed invention. Specifically, as explained in the response filed on December 1, 2003, Price does not receive a client request for help "related to a web page." Moreover, Price does not automatically provide information to "remotely access said web page." Instead, Price simply relates to a call center providing information for customers. There is no way for the call center to automatically obtain the information needed to remotely access the web page for which the client is seeking help. No such technique is anywhere suggested in any of the material cited in the office action.

Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 4, 2005



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation